

## NOTES ON SOME STREPTAXIDS

BY F. HAAS

FULTONELMA, n. subg. of *Elma*, type *E. (F.) inconspicua* (Morelet).

What are *Bulimus exiguus* and *B. inconspicuus*, both described by Morelet?

A. Morelet described in 1881 (*Journ. Conch. Paris*, 29) two species of *Bulimus* from the island Mayotte, Comoro Islands, to which he gave the names *B. inconspicuus* (p. 218, pl. 9, fig. 4) and *B. exiguus* (p. 218, pl. 9, fig. 6). These species seem to have been overlooked by following monographers, for Kobelt and Moellendorff do not list or mention them either in their catalogue (1903) or in their monograph (1899–1902) of the Buliminidae (= Enidae). This omission, however, is not on account of a better understanding of the two species in question, that is, to the discovery that they are not *Bulimus* at all, but belong rather to the family Streptaxidae; for had this been the case, they would have included them in their monograph of the Agnatha, pt. 1 (1902–1905). The credit for having recognized the true affinities of both "*Bulimus*" *exiguus* and *inconspicuus*, belongs to the late Hugh C. Fulton who sent specimens of both species, with the correct assignation to the streptaxid genus *Elma*, to Walter F. Webb, from whom they came, together with Mr. Webb's entire private collection of non-marine shells, to the Chicago Natural History Museum; moreover, in his copy of vol. 29 of the *Journal de Conchyliologie*, on p. 219, Fulton changed Morelet's generic name *Bulimus* to *Ennea (Elma)*; by a strange coincidence, Fulton's personal set of the *Journal de Conchyliologie* has come to rest in the library of the Chicago Natural History Museum, where Fulton's manuscript entry can be seen.

The reason why such an expert conchologist as A. Morelet arranged his two new species *exiguus* and *inconspicuus* with *Bulimus* rather than with the streptaxids, is because the two species mentioned, apparently alone among all the streptaxids, do not show the glossy, silky ivory surface that all their relatives exhibit. They are covered, instead, with a more or less striate

yellowish brown conchinc layer, such as most of the Enidae show; the remaining shell characters however, especially the receding upper edge of the peristome, are unmistakably streptaxid in nature.

In my opinion, the distinguishing character of *exiguus* and *inconspicuus*, places them apart from the remaining species of *Elma* and entitles them to a subgeneric unit of their own, for which, for reasons now understandable, I propose the name of *Fultonelma* n. subgen. with *Bulimus inconspicuus* Morelet as type species.

Since there exists an earlier *Bulimus exiguus* Reeve, 1850, *B. exiguus* Morelet, 1881, cannot retain its name: hence, I propose for it the new name *Elma bisexigua*. The synonymy reads as follows:

ELMA (FULTONELMA) BISEXIGUA, n. nom.

*Bulimus exiguus* Morelet, Journ. Conch. Paris, 29, p. 218, pl. 9, fig. 6, 1881; nec Reeve, Conch. Icon, 5, pl. 88, fig. 654, 1850.

THAUMATOGULELLA, subgen. n. for *Gulella prodigiosa* (E. A. Smith).

*Ennea prodigiosa*, described by E. A. Smith (Journ. Conch. London, 10, p. 316, pl. 4, fig. 11; 1902), is a *Gulella* in the generally accepted concept of the genus, but it cannot be properly placed in any of the known subgenera of *Gulella*. The solute last whorl and the characteristic peristomal sinulus, which is circular and almost closed, assign a special place to it. The new subgenus *Thaumatogulella* is therefore here proposed with *G. prodigiosa* as type and only species.

---

## ARNOLD EDWARD ORTMANN AS REVEALED BY HIS LETTERS

By HENRY VAN DER SCHALIE

There have been at least two informative biographical articles dealing with A. E. Ortmann (Pilsbry, *Nautilus*, 1927, 40: 109-111; and Holland, *Science*, January 14, 1927, 65: 29). The factual information contained in those publications need not be repeated here. The purpose of this account is to give a personal